

# CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL

## FINAL MEETING NOTES

Friday, November 14, 2003

10:00 am – 5:00 pm

*Visitors Auditorium, Channel Islands National Park Headquarters  
1901 Spinnaker Drive · Ventura Harbor, CA*

*NOTE: Audio tape recordings of the SAC meeting are available upon request; contact the SAC Coordinator at 805-884-1464.*

### Attending:

#### GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

##### **NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Member Mark Helvey

##### **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

Member Russell Galipeau

Alternate Gary Davis

##### **US COAST GUARD**

Alternate John Luzader

##### **MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Member Drew Mayerson

##### **US DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

Member Alex Stone

Alternate Walter Schobel

##### **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Alternate John Ugoretz

##### **CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Member Rebecca Roth

##### **COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Alternate Jack Peveler

#### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

##### **TOURISM**

Member Jeanette Webber [SAC Secretary]

Alternate Monica Baker

##### **RECREATION**

Member Jim Brye

Alternate Eric Kett

##### **CONSERVATION**

Alternate Greg Helms

##### **BUSINESS**

Member Michael Hanrahan

##### **FISHING**

Member Harry Liqournik

Alternate2 Merit McCrea

##### **EDUCATION**

Member Craig Taylor

##### **RESEARCH**

Member Dr. Robert Warner

##### **PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Robert Duncan

Alternate Avie Guerra

##### **PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Dr. Matthew Cahn [SAC Chair]

#### NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

##### **Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary**

Chris Mobley, Manager

##### **Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary**

Alternate Sean Morton, Management Plan Coordinator

**Absent:**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Alternate Christina Fahy

**US COAST GUARD**

Member J. Wade Russell

**MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

**CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

Member Brian Baird

Alternate Melissa Miller-Henson

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Member Marija Vojkovich

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Alternate Gary Timm

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Member Dianne Meester

Alternate Jackie Campbell

**COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Member Lyn Krieger

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:**CONSERVATION**

Member Linda Krop

**BUSINESS**

Alternate Darren Caesar

**FISHING**

Alternate1 Eric Hooper

**EDUCATION**

Alternate Barbara LaCorte

**RESEARCH**

Alternate Dr. Dan Brumbaugh

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate (seat vacant)

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary**

Member Bill Douros, Sanctuary Superintendent

**Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary**

Maria Brown, Acting Manager

**Attendance**

At roll call 12 voting seats were represented, with 17 present later in the day. Voting seats absent for the day were California Resources Agency and County of Santa Barbara. A total of 25 SAC representatives were in attendance for the day (13 members, 10 alternates, 2 non-voting). Public attendance peaked at about 13 individuals.

**Administrative Business and Announcements**

SAC Secretary Jeanette Webber announced that she would serve as Interim Chair while Chair Matthew Cahn was on his way to the meeting after teaching a class at California State University, Northridge.

***Announcement of Council Seat Vacancies***

Mike Murray announced that there are vacancies for both Recreational Fishing and Public At-Large alternate seats. Mike referred to an information sheet in the meeting packet explaining how to apply for seats, and indicated that interested parties should also see the CINMS web site. He asked that SAC representatives please notify people who would be good candidates. Chris Mobley acknowledged the new Chumash seat and explained that he is working with Roberta Cordero and the Chumash community to determine how to fill the seat. Chris stated that Roberta has agreed to attend in the interim as a liaison to that community until a representative to fill the seat has been selected.

***Travel Report from Former SAC Member Dick Holt***

Former SAC member Dick Holt made an announcement regarding his recent travels. Dick stated that he had had the opportunity to see what's happening outside the Channel Islands as he's traveled abroad on cruise ships. He commented on what he observed as the poor state of the oceans noting that 15 to 20 miles offshore the sea is full of chemical pollution, and other types of pollution coming from South and Central America. In Peru and Ecuador Dick observed tuna boats that carry 100s of tons of fish, with each weighing 1 to 200 pounds. He indicated that tuna landed in the area used to weigh 600 pounds. Captains he spoke to shrugged their shoulders at this trend, and still collect pay of \$1800 per trip, despite their disgust at the state of the

catch. Dick also stated that reefs are unhealthy due to abuse, overfishing, and pollution. Dick concluded by expressing his thankfulness for his experience on the Sanctuary Advisory Council, with special thanks extended to Mike Murray.

### ***Minerals Management Service Representation***

Jeanette Webber announced that there will be a change in representation for the Minerals Management Service (MMS) seat. MMS seat member Drew Mayerson acknowledged that he had represented his agency on the council for five years, and explained that it is time for “new blood.” Drew offered that he has learned a lot, and cannot commend sanctuary staff enough for the job they do. He explained that he was first introduced to the sanctuary ten years ago through Ed Cassano. Before that Drew said he didn’t know it existed, adding that not many people did. Since then awareness of the sanctuary has grown in his eyes, and in the eyes of everyone he knows at MMS. Drew explained that his replacement as the MMS member will be Joan Barminsky [present in the audience]. Drew stated that her background is the same as his. She is a geologist, who is well-versed, and heads the reservoir evaluation and production section. She is anxious to learn and share with the SAC all of the information he has regarding the oil industry and mineral industry that is so abundant in the Santa Barbara Channel. Jeanette Webber thanked Drew and acknowledged that the sanctuary only learned about the representation change yesterday so he will be provided with a plaque and official acknowledgement of his contribution at a later date. A hearty round of applause was provided for Drew.

### ***Sanctuary Manager’s Report***

Jeanette Webber commented that the report was very well done and she had noticed that it had been redone. Chris Mobley thanked Sarah MacWilliams and all the staff for putting the report together. Chris mentioned a slight clarification on page two regarding the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary selecting their interpretive center site, at the City of Santa Cruz Fun Spot by the wharf. Chris clarified that while the report says it will be built at the Fun Spot they’ve chosen the location among all the competing spots but whether it will be built depends on the availability of funding. The National Marine Sanctuary Program has a construction budget and they’re looking at what Congress will give us towards this and other projects, and there are probably opportunities to raise matching funds. Sean Morton added that it is going to be a partnership with the local Museum of Natural History.

Chris and sanctuary staff then highlighted several items from this edition of the report, noting that there is an amazing amount of activity going on in terms of biological and cultural resources:

- The sanctuary helped the National Marine Fisheries Service retrieve their multi-beam sonar unit off Cortez Bank. This was a great opportunity to work with tech divers, and involved multiple boats, and the California Department of Fish and Game.
- The R/V *Shearwater* was in Monterey for a few weeks helping Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary characterize habitat and species along the highway in the areas that are most likely to be affected by landslides from highway repair activity adjacent to the sanctuary. This will help them document the value of resources in case they are damaged in the future.
- Chris participated in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife *Delta* cruise. He explained that biologists aboard the *Delta* submersible can count fish, and are as accurate as bird watchers on a path. Some fisheries biologists want to see more quantitative data so they used lasers and other equipment to get more accurate measure and count of fish. They used several methods to determine if the software would accurately measure fish size and habitat. The idea is to increase quantitative methodology. There is also an observer on board who can see more than the technology is looking at which is important, especially if they are able to observe rare fish the technology might have missed.
- We have also been working with ROVs. In fact the *Shearwater* is working with an ROV today. We hope to use ROVs, the *Delta* and divers to have a robust monitoring program for marine reserves and to look at the effects of management. The *Shearwater* is a great research vessel for these sorts of activities.
- Concerning upcoming events – tomorrow is a big National Geographic donor trip of 100 folks who support National Geographic and its programs. They can go all over the world on these trips and this

year chose to come to the Channel Islands, once again highlighting that it is a special place. The will learn about the Jason Project, Channel Islands National Park and National Marine Sanctuary, conservation, maritime heritage, the fishing industry, kayakers, divers, and in general learn about the islands and people who use them. We will suggest that they keep an eye on the sanctuary and park and suggest that they look for ways to help us understand and manage resources.

- Channel Islands Naturalist Corps accomplishments are listed on pages 12 -13. Note that 90 volunteers documented over 10,000 hours of service, which is the equivalent of ten full time employees. You cannot overstate that contribution, they make a huge difference. We've combined the naturalist corps program with the park and Derek Lohuis, so our volunteers can be island naturalists and go on hikes as well. This is the beginning of many more productive partnerships with the park. The next recruitment for the naturalist corps is coming up now, so if you know of anyone who would be interested please tell them. Have them call Tina Reed if they are interested in that program.

- *Management Plan Review Process Update*

Mike Murray announced that he and Sarah MacWilliams wanted to provide a quick update on how things are going with the management plan review process, also an item in the Sanctuary Manager's Report. He referred to a handout in the meeting packet on the management plan review process, the second page of which was a flow chart for the internal clearance process. We are taking a bit longer to get through all of these steps. As a result if the clearance plays out like we hope it will we will be able to assure clearance this winter and try to get this thing out publicly for review and comment in February. When we do that it's important that council considers at the January meeting how to gear up for that release. Recall that we had talked about the Council's role in helping everyone learn what is in it, how to comment on it, and a strategy for how the SAC wants to comment on both the draft management plan and draft environmental impact statement. We'll talk at our January meeting about how to handle that. When we do take this public, every comment will be recorded closely and come back to the public in the final management plan with responses. We have also been working on retooling the plan based on input we've received from a number of viewers, included the SAC from last year. Sarah will tell you about a handout on some of your comments on the draft action plans and our responses to those. There has been a subtle change of action plan titles so they are realigned with issues, rather than our departments. Another thing that's going on is getting a response letter to some agencies that commented on a consultation letter at the end of summer. The NCCOS biogeography team has been working to find all data sets on fishes, mammals, sea birds, etc. in our marine region. They have initial data sets on web and are still on schedule to finish the biogeographic assessment relative to our future boundary decision in 2004.

Sarah referred to another hand out, the format of which looks similar to a summary report and highlights report that staff gave to the SAC last March. Sarah offered that the sanctuary would be happy to share those reports with SAC members who had not joined the Council as of last March. This repeats all of the written comments that were on the worksheet in which the SAC ranked whether it should be involved in certain activities and strategies, and how important SAC involvement was. But there were also several open-ended written comments that SAC members provided. She explained that basically what staff had done is compile all of those written comments which are organized according to the original programmatic action plans so SAC members may more easily find their comments. The report also mentions the new strategy titles, and shows how the old action plans have been broken up into issue based action plans. Sarah provided several examples of such changes, along with examples of comments and sanctuary responses to them. Sarah said that the sanctuary appreciates all of these comments very much. She also explained that in instances where the sanctuary response is simply, "Comment noted. Agreed." Sanctuary staff will or have taken action to adjust the management plan accordingly. Mike Murray added that there is a lot in here and Sarah interjected that she simply wanted to provide a sense of the types of comments received and sanctuary responses. Mike added that getting that feedback is really helpful since it is amazing what you can overlook, such as obvious omissions of a key partner, other things really stopped us and caused us to re-look at the document. Look through this at your leisure. Our door is always open to talk about how we're re-shaping the plan up to the public release. Mike asked SAC members to call sanctuary staff or send an email if SAC representatives want to

comment further.

Chris then solicited questions from the SAC on items in the Manager's Report.

Harry Liquornik asked whether the sanctuary had ever laid out why it is conducting the biogeographic assessment. He explained that the initial rationale for the sanctuary was a threat from oil and asked whether the sanctuary would do another threat assessment. Harry also asked whether this is part of the management plan as well. Mike Murray responded that there has to be a rigorous analysis of what we have in the current sanctuary boundary versus what we get if we went bigger. He explained that the criteria for whether there should be an expansion will come into play and indicated that one piece of data lacking that Dan Basta pointed out was biogeography. Mike acknowledged that this doesn't provide information on threats, nor whether we incorporate them or stay away from them. He concluded that Harry's point is valid that we need to know, "What are the threats? Why would we want to consider expanding the boundary?" Mike said that while it seems that all work is on biogeography, really a lot of work has been done on socioeconomics, and other issues.

Rebecca Roth asked whether sanctuary staff wanted to have a discussion at the January meeting about the SAC's role with respect to the public release of the management plan. Mike Murray answered that in January staff would provide another update and if we are close to the public release January seems like a logical time to assess the Council's role out plan, what groups they want to form, and what their timeline is. Rebecca commented that she would then recommend strongly that the SAC get a presentation from the biogeography team in January to learn where they're at, and how it fits into the process so the SAC can have a meaningful deliberation. She noted that this seems to be important to the administration. Chris Mobley mentioned that the plan at this time has a discussion of the boundary issue, but doesn't present a decision on boundary redefinition. He noted that it is perfectly appropriate to get an update, though the boundary issue is off the table for this iteration of the management plan. Mike Murray stated that the boundary will be addressed in 2004-2005 in a supplemental decision. He noted that the February draft management plan released will refer to the boundary evaluation process as a work in motion that will conclude when the data comes together. Mike clarified that the sanctuary will have consultations and provide a draft release, public comment, and the whole lot. Mike added that for those SAC representatives who were not here at the time, we decided that we would defer a boundary redefinition decision to a supplemental process.

### ***Council Member Announcements***

John Ugoretz announced a letter from the California Department of Fish and Game to affected and interested parties stating that the Department is following a federal decision to close all (commercial and recreational) groundfish fishing for the entire State of California, which is also in place for Oregon and Washington, beginning Thursday, November 21 at 12:01 am. He stated that the decision comes based primarily on the catch of two overfished species: canary rockfish and lingcod. He added that there have also been unexpectedly high recreational catches of many other nearshore species which is believed to have occurred based on the fact that most of the shelf was closed this year, causing higher pressure on nearshore fish. He added that the Department expects a regional closure on rockfish to be in effect in January and February. They expect a ten-month fishing season this coming year, much better than last couple years, and expect a deeper allowable fishing range to 60 fathoms instead of 20 fathoms. Opportunities next year should be better, they hope that by allowing deeper fishing those nearshore fish won't see as much pressure and won't have to be closed as early.

Jack Peveler asked when they would know whether or not it would go to 60 fathoms. John responded that he is not sure when they would know for certain, but the recreational regulations are discussed at the December Fish and Game Commission meeting so he said he expects that we will know in December.

Bob Warner asked if the decisions are based mainly on landings. John replied that the recreational data is based on the marine recreational fishing statistics survey. John noted that there are problems with that survey, but conceded that the catches this year are something on the order of five times above the allowable

catch. He stated that they are pretty certain that it's been exceeded, though whether it's been exceeded by five fold or one fold doesn't matter. He added that there is also the party boat data for recreation, and the commercial data is based on landings information. To Bob's question of whether there is any fisheries-independent data feeding into the decisions at this point John responded that there is not at this point.

Mark Helvey announced that Tina Fahy will be leaving as the NMFS SAC alternate due to her taking over as Turtle Coordinator. He introduced Craig Heberer who is with the NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division, and has been involved in the Highly Migratory Management Plan. Mark explained that Craig may be playing the role of SAC NMFS alternate who is here today as an observer.

Greg Helms stated that he was struck by the presentation on groundfish where there is an unexpected high catch and a more rapid attainment of the limits on rockfish, but next year we are expecting greater opportunities and a broader range. He asked if this is all about distributing the catch to deeper water and trying to get a more balanced distribution of fishing. John Ugoretz acknowledged that that is a big part of it and stated that in particular in southern California the allowable catch for bocaccio has gone up significantly, which was previously a limiting factor, so this allows more opportunities. He added that canary is a much more northern species and he is not sure how the changes in the regulations will impact expected catch of canary. Greg Helms said it sounds like they are bouncing from species to species and asked about cowcod in deeper water. John said it doesn't change the cowcod closure areas since those were designed specifically for protecting cowcod. John added that it is a very complex issue, and they are dealing with fish that have rebuilding plans and very strict limits on what can and can't be caught. John stated that the decisions made this year at the Council with regard to next year's fishing have changed a lot of those allowable catches. He concluded that we are shooting for managing towards a low allowable catch even though the adopted allowable catch is at a medium level. The idea is that if you are managing at that low level and it is exceeded slightly you are still below that actual number you are shooting for. Jeanette Webber suggested that any more questions for John could be discussed during a break.

Merit McCrea announced that Tom Raftican couldn't be here today, though he is very interested in the Recreational Fishing Seat. Merit acknowledged that Tom has very close contact with anglers in southern California.

Sean Morton made several announcements related to the Manager's Report. He acknowledged that the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary did launch the SIMoN web site, which they have been working on this for two to three years. Sean encouraged everyone to go to it, stating that it is a good source of information for all habitats in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and will eventually be expanded to cover all of California. Sean also stated that the *Shearwater* cruises in Monterey went well. Lastly, Sean announced that there are many seats coming open on the Monterey Bay SAC in February: conservation, fishing, business, recreation and others. Sean asked if SAC members know anyone in the Monterey Bay area who may be interested that they please encourage those people to go to the Monterey Bay sanctuary web site.

Mike Murray made an announcement on behalf of Melissa Miller-Hensen and Brian Baird regarding a memo from Mary Nichols, Secretary of the Resources Agency, which explains best why they couldn't be at the meeting. Brian and Melissa are not sure who will remain from their agency and in what capacity. Mike stated that hopefully we will see them at the next SAC meeting.

## Public Comment

Jeanette Webber announced that in keeping with the agenda it was time for the public comment period. She asked if there were any members of the public who would like to address the Council.

One gentleman announced that he just returned from a tour of Newfoundland, the Grand Banks and Nova Scotia. He stated that the SAC probably knows what's going on there with the cod fishing having been

destroyed. He stated, "For God's sake do not give up the fight," commenting that they had gone to all the historic ports whether they were cod or whale. He noted that they had several days and spent a lot of time with fishermen in Nova Scotia. It was absolutely and they are furious with their government for allowing this to happen. He added that the snow crabs are okay and also provided information on the lobster fishery.

## **Administrative Business and Announcements Continued**

### ***Meeting Notes***

Jeanette Webber asked SAC representatives whether they had any comments and/or questions on the draft SAC meeting notes from September 19, 2003. The SAC had no comments or questions on the draft meeting notes and voice-voted unanimously to approve them.

## **SAC Retreat Report**

Mike Murray provided a slide show and offered highlights from the Council's October 28 – 30 retreat to Santa Cruz Island. Mike stated that it was about more than fun and seeing the islands, but also getting to know more about park and sanctuary and getting to know each other better. He stated that he was pleased that 13 SAC representatives were able to participate, noting that the "world record" for our retreats is 16. Mike stated that in the future the sanctuary will try to continue to keep retreats flexible to accommodate people who are only available to participate for one night. Mike offered thanks to sanctuary staff, who also had a good turnout for the retreat. Additionally, Mike extended thanks to Lyndal Laughrin, Director of the UCSB Santa Cruz Island Natural Reserve Field Station, along with Bill Faulkner of Channel Islands National Park who served as the naturalist extraordinaire.

Mike explained that we have retreats to: safely bring people to the islands and sanctuary, to strengthen our relationships with one another, to learn more about the sanctuary and park, and to facilitate thoughtful creative discussions about how to run the sanctuary and SAC. He noted that no votes, decisions or council business took place. Activities Mike highlighted included: a cruise on the *Shearwater* that allowed everyone to learn about its capabilities; a cruise along the north side of Santa Cruz Island; trips to Valley Anchorage and Christy Beach; a tour of the historic ranch structures and park service facilities; coastal bluff hikes; and opportunities to learn about aspects of the sanctuary and park thanks to Channel Islands Naturalist Corps volunteer Dominique Esquibel, and Bill Faulkner of the park. Mike explained that Lyndal is an expert on Santa Cruz Island ecology, and Bill Faulkner taught us about bald eagle reintroduction and exotic species. Mike referred to a hand out for today's council meeting in which Sarah MacWilliams recorded a discussion held on the retreat about: sac projects; sac outreach to constituencies; interest in bringing more experts, educators, and graduate students to meetings; the link between the SAC and sanctuary and research going on in Channel Islands; and a working group or research activities panel. Mike also noted a comment from Gary Davis about how rare it is for a federal agency to have an advisory council. Overall, Mike concluded that many participants indicated that things seem to be working better than when the SAC started in 1998, though the SAC is currently in a lag between decision points after the roller coaster state marine reserves process. To conclude his presentation Mike showed a series of images set to music, concluding with a slide offering thanks to important people who made this happen, and asked for questions and comments.

Jim Brye stated that he came away from the retreat with several observations and revelations. First, he observed: that the agenda was loose and allowed for participants to be able to get to know one another better, and even had people from agencies and the private sector working together (for example, he joked that clean up efforts by he and John of the US Coast Guard produced the cleanest toilets ever seen at the field station); that Chris Mobley plays a really mean guitar and is an accomplished vocal artist which was fun; and that Rebecca Young successfully made a very rough voyage without feeding the fish. Jim's revelations included that through this experience and a second experience he had at the field station recently, he was very impressed with the close working relationships between various agencies and the public sector including the park service, sanctuary, Island Packers, the Nature Conservancy, and the general public. Jim noted that when Ed Cassano brought us together five years ago his vision was that we would serve as a liaison, not be another

bureaucratic overlay. He added that in business CEOs talk about synergy, which sounds great but never works. Jim stated that this is a good example of how it does work. The sanctuary is embedded in the work of the park service with good examples from Laura, Shauna, Julie, and Island Packers. They achieve real, tangible results from working together. He also acknowledged the Conservancy supporting the park in terms of logistics. On that point Jim concluded that though he was a skeptic at first he has come to witness that it does work. Jim's last revelation pertained to the impact of fast aluminum boats on getting people to the islands, for example on Island Packers and the *Shearwater*. According to Jim it takes a sailor three and a half hours to get to where the SAC went for the retreat. He said that prior to this experience of going out on two power catamarans and returning on two monohulls the impact that day trips, which were never before possible, have on resources had never really occurred to him. Jim indicated that this puts the burden on us for managing resources, while it also provides a great opportunity for outreach and getting people to understand the resource. Jim also referenced a newspaper article that reported on a study which showed a dramatic increase in visitors to the islands.

Michael Hanrahan stated that he went on the retreat both last year and this year and highly recommended that people who weren't able to go this year, go next year. Acknowledging that participants were taken to the islands on the *Shearwater*, Michael indicated that he wanted to focus on the ride home which occurred on the *Truth*. Michael stated that he worked for Island Packers for several years as a second captain and crew member and that he is familiar with responsibilities of the captains and crewmembers for taking people to the islands. Michael observed that on the trip home: the captain and crew of *Truth* failed the passengers, it was a rough day, there were significant seas, there were many people who were very sea sick and scared, and deck equipment was not well-secured which put people on the deck trying to ride through the storm in harm's way. Michael mentioned that he befriended a young couple on board from Ontario who had an eight year old girl with them. He stated that they had never been to the Channel Islands, nor to California, nor on the Pacific Ocean before. Michael made the point that we have a responsibility to this family - in fact in the National Marine Sanctuaries Act it states that part of the mandate is to enhance public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the marine environment. He noted that when we send people onto the water the main way in which people experience the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary is via a boat, and typically by *Truth* Aquatics and by Island Packers. Michael said that a safe and comfortable ticket to and from those islands is necessary and mandated. From his perspective, that was not offered on the trip back from Santa Cruz Island. He observed that this young girl was left alone on the top deck of *Truth* while her parents were on the lower deck and very sick. He said he looked into her eyes and she was petrified of being alone, and in heavy seas without her parents nearby. Michael acknowledged that he did not wish to say that it is the crew's responsibility to make sure that passenger's are not scared, though from his perspective it is, but it speaks to a bigger picture which is when people go on the water on these boats how do we ensure that their experience of a sanctuary is one where they feel safe and comfortable and then appreciate the sanctuary and look to support and protect those waters of the sanctuary. The girl eventually came down the stairs and her parents were asking Michael, "Where is the crew? Why is the crew not on deck checking to make sure that we are all safe and comfortable?" According to Michael the reality was that not once during the two and a half to three hour crossing did passengers see the crew since they were up in the wheel house hanging out with the captain - which he understands is not typical of the *Truth* boats, and he said he knows is not typical of Island Packers since he's spent a lot of time on their boats. He stated that he is not looking to point fingers at *Truth* by any stretch, but he does think that as a SAC, representatives should examine the mandate from the Act - enhancing public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the marine environment. He asked how will an eight year old appreciate the sanctuary and therefore the ocean when her first experience on the sea was one of complete terror? Michael recognized that the National Park concessionaires have areas they are meant to fulfill: educating people, keeping them safe, etc. He suggested to address this perhaps the SAC should examine for the sanctuary that there are recommendations made for passenger vessels that go into the sanctuary and that these criteria need to be met, such as: making sure passengers feel safe and secure, that they are well-educated about the environment they're going into, etc. He acknowledged that he is not sure if this is something the SAC can vote or act on. Michael concluded that this is something that means a lot to him as someone who was brought up in fear of the sea because of his



first two experiences on the water (which he has gotten over after more time on the water). He said he does not care to disenfranchise another child from the ocean because of a lazy crew.

Jeanette Webber thanked Michael for his comments and stated that she is not sure that it is in the SAC's purview but said that they would certainly consider it. She asked for additional comments on the retreat.

Russell Galipeau stated that one of the things he learned in his education as well as through becoming a leader in the National Park Service is how important it is that we all work together to become citizens of our communities, which means participation. Russell stated that this advisory council provides that opportunity for us to express our citizenship and some common goals. He thought that the retreat really builds on that and gives us an opportunity to work together, and solve problems. He said that now we'll go work with other people and help build a better community.

Regarding Michael's comment Russell stated that some of his comments are well-founded, and that it is always good to tell the park service what are quality experiences. He noted that he has taken that particular case and written a letter to *Truth* asking that they revise their operating plan that clearly articulates what they need to be doing not only in regulations, but also to make sure that the visitor walks away with a good experience. They are about providing a visitor experience in a safe manner. Russell said that the park always provides input on what everybody thinks. He concluded that while he did not know whether it is an item for the SAC, it is definitely an item for Michael as a citizen to tell us what is a quality experience so he can make sure his contractors are providing it.

Eric Kett asked Michael if he made a comment directly to the ownership at Truth Aquatics. Michael responded that he had not. Eric stated that having been a former operator of Truth he is very familiar with that organization and their operations. He indicated that to come before a council of this nature and make the comments Michael did is in extremely poor taste. He stated that as a very loyal Truth Aquatics person he is very disappointed that Michael would do this, especially as a business representative. According to Eric, it is inappropriate of Michael to make these statements in front of this council and this public without first going to the ownership of that company and presenting exactly the same story. He added that Michael's comments were such a dramatic story, that he should have first gone to the concessionaire. Eric also noted that for Michael to have been working for another concessionaire, and knowing that responsibility would have had a tremendous impact on them, but to come before a public and this council and make those types of comments – Jeanette Webber then interjected and thanked Eric for his comments and suggesting discussing this aside from the council – Eric stated that possibly they can but that it was necessary in light of the public to bring up that that effort wasn't made which disappointed him.

Jeanette Webber thanked him for his comment and asked Chris if he had any other comments to make about the retreat. He stated that he hopes that in the future we can get broad representation from everyone, and acknowledged that it is more difficult for folks who have to go out and catch fish and do other things like that it is more difficult to go on such trips, but he hopes to see them in the future.

Jeanette stated that she would be turning things over to Matt Cahn who had arrived from his class. Matt greeted SAC representatives and apologized for being late. Matt then turned things over to John Ugoretz and Sean for an update on marine reserves.

## **Update: Marine Reserves**

### ***Report on implementation and management of state MPAs (John Ugoretz)***

John Ugoretz provided updates on monitoring activities that have been taking place at the Channel Islands and elsewhere that will be supportive for understanding the effects of marine reserves. These activities include a nearshore groundfish tagging project, ROV (remotely operated vehicle) work coordinated by the Sanctuary, and a party boat groundfish tagging project. For the rockfish tagging project, John explained that

many fish have been tagged (tens of thousands) and emphasized that fishermen need to know about this. SCA members discussed briefly the advantages and challenges of tagging programs.

***Report on enforcement for marine reserves***

Sean Hastings from CINMS reminded the SAC about the enforcement advice the Marine Reserves Working Group had developed by consensus in 1999-2001, and commented that the Sanctuary has been working to meet that advice. Sean noted and briefly commented on three existing enforcement agreements in place that affect Sanctuary waters:

- NOAA and State of California (used for cross-deputizing officers)
- US Coast Guard and National Marine Sanctuary Program (USCG policy statement supporting Sanctuaries enforcement)
- National Park Service and National Marine Sanctuary Program

In light of the state government budget crisis and the strong need for enforcement support to assure the marine reserves at Channel Islands are successful, Rebecca Roth offered a motion to suggest that the SAC write a letter to the Governor of California. The Council voted 14-0-2 to write a letter to the new California Governor's office requesting that resources be maintained for personnel and programs needed to support monitoring and management the state marine reserves at the Channel Islands. Two seats abstained from voting: Dept. of Fish and Game and U.S. Coast Guard. The letter will be drafted by Sanctuary staff and distributed in draft form to SAC members prior to being sent. This action was taken by the SAC with the understanding that it had not been specifically placed on the agenda, but represented an urgent action requiring immediate attention given that the state budget would be determined prior to the next SAC meeting. It was understood that recently adopted SAC meeting protocols allowed for this type of flexibility.

Sean Hastings also raised the idea of the Marine Stewardship Council conducting a review of some CINMS fisheries with a goal of seeking a "sustainable" rating. The criteria for such a rating is rigorous, Sean explained, and there is a significant price for conducting a preassessment. Matt Cahn summarized the SAC's discussion and questions by noting that it seems like the Council is interested in hearing more about this in the future.

***Jurisdictional roles of the NOAA National Ocean Service and NOAA Fisheries in establishing Marine Protected Areas***

Chris Mobley explained that there was a recent presentation before the Pacific Fishery Management Council, leadership from NOAA's National Ocean Service and NOAA Fisheries. The presentation, Chris said, aimed to explain how NOS and Fisheries work together on ecosystem management. Ecosystem management is a cross-cutting goal across many NOAA line offices. MPAs are a hot topic now for NOAA, and a tool acknowledged for use and experimentation. Existing laws on the books call for coordination between Sanctuaries and the Fishery Management Councils. Channel Islands is being looked to as a place where NOAA must come together to successfully coordinate and provide ecosystem management. Chris also said that many comments provided at the PFMC meeting, however, suggested that Sanctuaries should stay completely out of fisheries management.

Rebecca Roth suggested that the MPA Center (Charlie Wahle) and someone from the Pew Oceans Commission should perhaps be invited to speak to the SAC, as well as someone from the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

In response to questions from Harry Liquornik, Chris explained that the forthcoming EIS on marine reserves will contain a range of alternatives, not just status quo and the state's previous preferred alternative.

## **Announcement: California Draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan**

Ian Taniguchi with the California Department of Fish and Game explained a soon-to-be-released draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan. Ian discussed the mandates for the plan, including requirements for good scientific background information on all abalone species, the need for alternatives for harvest, timelines for estimating long and short term goal achievement, measurable criteria, and constituent input. Ian explained that some public meetings have already been held, and a peer review process was used to modify the plan. Special meetings coming up at which the public can comment are scheduled for November 19 in Monterey and two others (not yet scheduled) in northern and southern California.

SAC members discussed the plan and asked questions about:

- Coordination with white abalone recovery efforts (pursuant to the Endangered Species Act)
- Is aquaculture recommended (some alternatives are proposed)
- Discouraged by existing lack of repeatable data collected from abalone grounds due to lack of monitoring
- What is known about withering disease (there is good data on this from black abalone at the Channel Islands, but little field data for other species)
- Is there a new bacteria that affects abalone, or is the susceptibility of the abalone new (not sure)

## **Presentation: Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO) (Jenn Caselle)**

Dr. Jenn Caselle provided a presentation on the Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO), with emphasis on the program's contributions to the monitoring of effects from Channel Island marine reserves. Dr. Caselle explained that the PISCO program was not originally set up for monitoring of marine reserves, but changes have recently been made to accommodate the newly established protected areas. Dr. Caselle presented information to the SAC on:

- the location of PISCO marine monitoring sites in Washington, Oregon and California
- PISCO monitoring objectives
- Channel Islands monitoring sites (in more detail)
- The collaborative effort between PISCO, the Sanctuary and the California Department of Fish and Game
- Sampling methods for monitoring at the Channel Islands (reef characterizations, high numbers of fish transects, nit fixed in place, many depth stratifications)
- What is counted (all fish seen, visual estimates of fish size, fish density, fish at bottom/mid/surface levels)
- PISCO kelp surveys
- Process surveys (fish recruitment, oceanographic processes)
- Annual community surveys
- SMURF (moored devices for catching larval and other drift organism)
- Modifications made in 2003 to assist with marine reserves

Dr. Caselle also discussed what all of the PISCO monitoring activities mean for marine reserves. She explained that some of the PISCO monitoring is contributing to understanding of baseline conditions. Dr. Caselle also explained that comparisons of marine life inside and outside of marine reserves would be possible using PISCO data over time.

SAC representatives engaged in discussion and questions, asking about such aspects of the PISCO monitoring programs as:

- The number of divers involved (6-7 per site over 3 days, 128 total thus far)
- Funding sources (Packard Foundation grant)

- If Santa Barbara Island was monitoring (not yet)
- Why certain areas of the islands seem to be better for fish recruitment (not sure, related to the gyre)
- Will the sampling array be large enough to show if reserves are working (yes, some unknown magnitude of changes within and outside of reserves should be detectable)
- CDFG will not provide much funding to PISCO in 2004, so funding will be an issue
- Can PISCO monitoring say more about general ecosystem health than marine reserves effects (that would take even more time)

## **Presentation: Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) Terminal Development Proposal off the Coast of Oxnard (“Cabrillo Port”)**

Mike Murray introduced Mr. Steven Meheen Project Manager for BHP Billiton’s Cabrillo Port project. Steven offered thanks for being invited to the meeting and stated that he would like to leave an open invitation for anyone who wants to learn more about the project to come to his office, set up an appointment, visit their web site, or give them a call. Steve introduced Tom Umenhofer, an environmental consultant with Entrex, who was seated in the audience and Cathy Hahn also with Entrex. Steve explained that BHP Billiton is a large resource company based out of Melbourne, Australia that has no other activities in California outside of this project, but has projects in Texas, New Mexico, and Wyoming. He stated that they are the largest aluminum and base metal producer in world, a diamond producer, one of largest coal producers in the world, involved in the petroleum sector, and the largest producer of stainless steel products in the world. He said that they have about 40 thousand employees in 80 different countries. According to Steven the purpose of the Cabrillo Port project is to transport natural gas from Australia to California. The gas is cooled until it condenses into a liquid (which takes up 1/600<sup>th</sup> of the space required by the gas), than transported by ship. This has been done regularly in the Pacific basin and BHP Billiton has imported LNG to the Japanese market since 1981. This project will receive LNG, bring it to shore, warm it back to a gaseous state and move it through California pipelines. Steven explained that most electricity in the U.S. is generated from natural gas, a commodity that is not in infinite supply though we rely more and more on it. In California he explained that we produces 15% of the natural gas we use, with the remaining 85% imported from outside of the state. Overall he said that the U.S. energy industry has a gap between production and consumption. According to Steven one solution is to import natural gas from Canada, another is to import LNG, while a third option is to have a pipeline from Alaska - but that is relatively expensive and may be costly to the environment. He went on to explain the pipeline infrastructure in California and explained that we are now switching more pipelines in the U.S. to natural gas which he indicated in the fuel paradigm is the fuel of choice and more environmentally friendly. He went on to explain that we cannot have a hydrogen economy without natural gas and indicated that extraction from water is not economically feasible at this time. Mr. Meheen concluded that increased LNG use will reduce the use of pipelines, reduce our dependence upon ancient basins, and reduce dependence on gas produced in California. He added that LNG is lighter than water, evaporates off water without sheen or film, does not mix with water, is non-toxic, non-corrosive, and has an odor that is added as required by law so that it may be detected if there is a leak.

He then explained further the plan to add a Cabrillo Port offshore terminal and pipeline to shore that would connect to the power plant at Ormond Beach. He explained that they went through a difficult screening regimen looking at sites from Canada to Baja that are conducive to offshore operations, away from populated areas and responsible about what they are doing. He discussed the appropriateness of this offshore facility that would be located over 20 miles from Pt. Hueneme and 25 miles from Oxnard, stating that it: would not disturb beach front communities, would avoid marine mammal migration patterns, would be over 18 miles from the outer boundary of the marine sanctuary, would be near the Pacific Missile Testing Range of Pt. Mugu, and be within the Navy surveillance pattern. He indicated that these latter characteristics may be beneficial in terms of discouraging terrorist activities. He also advocated for moving the shipping lanes outside of the Channel. He stated that benefits of the project would include: reduced reliance on interstate pipelines; introduction of a new gas supply to California; increased supply diversity; the creation of 75 to 90 jobs; and provision of a new tax source. Uses of LNG that he summarized included: buses, power

generation, cooking, heating homes, and motor fuel refineries. Steven also explained the aesthetics of the proposed facility stating that it looks like a barge, and he showed slides from commissioned visualization studies to indicate the site's visibility from the PCH on clear and marine layer days.

Additionally, Steven commented on another company's LNG project being proposed to utilize Platform Grace. He stated that his company did not think re-utilization of a platform was viable, adding that this particular project is three miles from the sanctuary boundary. According to Steven BHP Billiton anticipates that the sanctuary boundary will be extended to the mainland shoreline. Drew Mayerson indicated that Platform Grace is routinely inspected with the same fervor applied to all platforms in the OCS, and that this project will be reviewed when it comes time.

At the conclusion of the presentation SAC members provided questions and comments. In response to the comments and questions raised Steven offered more information. There are three LNG projects in California, though the Cabrillo Port project is the only one to submit an application, and there is also one in Baja. According to Steven the California economy shouldn't be hinged by importing foreign product through Mexico and then bringing it back here, since companies bring products to Mexico to skirt California regulations and environmental concerns. Steven explained that up to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day of LNG could be processed at the project, noting that it's a matter of supply and demand on the California gas system and the ability to access it. He also added that they estimate about two ships per week would be present with about a 24 hour period occurring from the time a ship enters the vessel management system, reaches the port, discharges and leaves the area. He stated that the Cabrillo Port project would be in about 2900 feet of water, and though it would cost less money to put the facility closer to shore they have not done so in part because at the selected site the bottom is alluvial gravel substrate and there is not a lot of marine life at its depth. He indicated that an undersea pipeline would be constructed from the facility to the power plant at Ormond Beach that is already connected to large diameter pipes within the California natural gas pipeline system, and is the closest access point to that system in the region (which is 40 miles inland in most places). He also explained that he understands there is neither a lot of recreational or boating traffic, nor much commercial fishing in the area, though Harry Liqournik indicated that there is some trawl fishing there. Steven informed the SAC that the project pipeline would be buried in portion but that California earthquake law prevents burying and restraining pipelines; however, he stated that the pipeline will settle due to its natural weight to where it is flush with seabed. He also explained that the project would not be operational until mid-2008. Concerning security concerns Steven stated that there will be a small no-access buffer as required in the C.F.R. (which he said gives you about 1000 yards). He also explained that the gas on the Cabrillo Port barge facility would not be pressurized and would be essentially in an open container, with the facility drawing on a certain amount of the gas for its own operations.

Greg Helms raised the point that if a selling point for the project is that California uses more natural gas than it produces this area wouldn't fall under that category. He explained that there is a sense locally that we've paid our fair share in impacts of California gas production. Steven responded that while we may be holding our own in this area, we are not producing enough to meet our own surplus needs. Tom Humanoff added that the gas produced locally is of a different quality so the issue is more about quality than a supply issue.

Greg Helms also pointed out that not only is the proposed site near a military installation, national marine sanctuary and national park (an area of unbelievable natural diversity and vulnerability), but there are onshore constraints as well including a large wetland. Greg stated that there must be a better place for the project. Steven replied that BHP Billiton has been engaged with Peter Brand who manages the wetland area for many months, is one of largest contributors world-wide to wetlands restoration, and even self-imposes taxes for greenhouse gas emissions when operating in countries not signatory to the Kyoto protocol, and donates over 1% of its gross income (20-30 billion per year) to environmental concerns.

Matt Cahn thanked Steven for his presentation, indicated an interest in hearing more about this topic, stated that it would be discussed further in January, and suggested wrapping it up to move on to the discussion of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act reauthorization. Steven stated that his company is available to return to

the SAC or meet with separate groups and individuals at any time.

## **National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA or Act) Reauthorization**

Mike Murray explained that he would provide a standard presentation that on NMSA reauthorization that is being shown to all SACs. Mike explained that the NMSA is the foundation for national marine sanctuaries and contains the policies and guidelines for how we manage them, along with procedures and criteria for designating new sanctuaries, the authorities provided to NOAA, and guidelines for the Congressional funding schedule over five year time frames. It is currently up for reauthorization in 2005. Mike indicated that Dan Basta, Director of the National Marine Sanctuary Program, wants to give all SACs an early opportunity to weigh in on the current, or 6<sup>th</sup>, NMSA reauthorization process. He explained that there is an opportunity to craft an early draft as a starting point for bills that surface later in Congress, which has re-evaluated the NMSA every five years since 1972. Mike referenced a handout in the meeting packet that provides information on how the Act has been changed by Congress through time.

Mike's presentation explained the types of changes that have occurred during past reauthorizations, including a requirement for other federal agencies to consult with the National Marine Sanctuary Program on any of their activities that have the potential to injure sanctuary resources, stipulations about management plan review, issuance of special use permits, and wording changes to update language. He explained what the SAC's role is in NMSA reauthorization, mentioning that the National Marine Sanctuary Program is asking councils to identify a short list of the top five changes of most interest to them, including the rationale for the suggested changes. This will provide a sense of how all SACs across the nation feel about changing the Act. Mike indicated that in every advisory council charter it says not to lobby congress, so all Councils must provide input to the National Marine Sanctuary Program directly through their Sanctuary Manager or Superintendent. Advice is due before December 20, 2003. Mike noted that there is no guarantee that SAC advice will be reflected in the Administration's bill, which if cleared by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) would likely be presented to Congress in January or February, 2005

Following his presentation Mike acknowledged that this is an inherently difficult request and explained that his intent is not to guide or steer any particular suggestions but he thought it might be helpful to share some ideas from SACs at the Monterey Bay and Olympic Coast national marine sanctuaries (other councils have not yet weighed in on it). He included a handout from the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary SAC in the meeting packet.

The SAC deliberated over how to handle the discussion and how to provide comments, especially given the pending December 20<sup>th</sup> deadline. SAC members agreed that it made sense to come up with a general list of comments that everyone could agree with at this meeting and that could be provided by the December 20<sup>th</sup> deadline, and then to revisit the issue and address more details at the January meeting which could likely be provided as follow-up comments, though they may be less influential since they would be received after the deadline. The list of recommendations that the SAC verbally agreed to is described below. [Tapes of the meeting are available upon request for the full discourse that resulted in this list.]

- (a) *Sec. 313 – Authorization of Appropriations*: consider explicit appropriations of funds beyond sanctuary program base funds specifically for 1) management, 2) research, and 3) monitoring/inventorying.
- (b) *Sec. 313 – Authorization of Appropriations*: authorization language should require NOAA to consider the size of a given sanctuary, and the population adjacent to the sanctuary in appropriating money for each sanctuary site (similar to language contained in the Coastal Zone Management Act or CZMA).
- (c) *Sec. 301 – Findings, Purposes and Policies; Establishment of System*: this section should make a statement about water quality since sanctuaries need to deal with watershed issues and water quality issues, urban runoff, and nonpoint source pollution.

- (d) *Sec. 301 – Findings, Purposes and Policies; Establishment of System*: this section addresses at length the idea of comprehensive, coordinated management. This idea is more simply articulated by the concept of “ecosystem-based management.” Language on this concept should be added
- (e) *Sec. 301 – Findings, Purposes and Policies; Establishment of System (b) Purposes and Policies (4-6)*: this section uses language such as, “conservation, manage, enhance, protect, etc...” There is no language about being user-friendly. Consider using language like that used by the National Park Service (FY 00 mandate), “...provide for enjoyment of future generations,” which is soft and user-friendly. Sanctuaries are places that can be used and not just protected.
- (f) *Sec. 304 – Procedures for Designation and Implementation (e) Review of Management Plans*: Support OCNMS recommendation 1 that states, “Recommendation: Section 304 (e) Review of Management Plans, page 9 the review should occur every 10 years, not every 5 years. Given the time and energy spent on the current management plan reviews, that seems a more cost-effective approach.” Additionally, stipulate a time limit for the review/clearance period.
- (g) *Sec. 304 – Procedures for Designation and Implementation*: this section provides a process for designating new sanctuaries, but does not clearly delineate a process for redefining the boundary of an existing sanctuary. Provide specificity on the process for changing the boundary of an existing sanctuary: clarify if it is the same as the process for designating a new sanctuary, or provide a new process for boundary changes to existing sanctuaries.
- (h) *Sec. 304 – Procedures for Designation and Implementation (f) Limitation on Designation of New Sanctuaries*: the limitation on the designation of new sanctuaries may be inconsistent with the requirement that every five years we review the adequacy of sanctuary boundaries to manage an ecosystem or ecosystem component. If the limitation is intended to address new sanctuary designations alone, not boundary changes to existing sanctuaries, a clarification of that point is warranted. Mike Murray explained that this clause was largely the result of efforts to establish a sanctuary in the Northwest Straits area of Washington State. Chris Mobley offered to learn more about this clause, before the January meeting, as it pertains to significant boundary changes to existing sanctuaries.
- (i) *Sec. 304 – Procedures for Designation and Implementation (d) Interagency Cooperation*: formalize the idea of interagency cooperation described in this section of the Act and discussed more broadly in terms of the concept of “one NOAA” by having sanctuary managers serve on the appropriate regional Fishery Management Councils. This will keep those councils apprised of what sanctuaries are doing and vice versa.
- (j) Review findings of the Pew and U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy reports. Consider building elements of these reports into the National Marine Sanctuary Program.
- (k) Agree with OCNMS recommendation 3 that states, “Strengthen Permitting Requirements - Act and Regulations. Recommendation: To prevent damage to Sanctuaries from failures of permittees to fully perform on the terms of their permits, or from bankruptcy, permits shall be required to include either a bond or cash deposit, which covers the full costs of any required monitoring and the full cost of removal of all equipment and any other required restoration at the termination or in case of default on the permit.”
- (l) *Sec. 304 – Procedures for Designation and Implementation (b) Taking Effect of Designations (1) Notice*: Correct the misspelling underlined in the following passage, “...The designation... and regulations shall take effect and become final after the close of a review period of forty-five days of continuous session of Congress... unless in the case of a natural [sic] marine sanctuary....”

The group agreed to submit a list of consensus/non-consensus recommendations. After some modifications, which are reflected in the list above, SAC representatives present agreed to submit each item on this list as recommendations for the NMSA reauthorization.

Other main points raised by SAC representatives and staff:

- Consider seeking additional funds for sanctuaries engaged in fisheries management, resource recovery, or marine reserves that require additional funds. This detailed comment went with recommendation (a) part 3 above. John Ugoretz expressed concern that requesting that sanctuaries

with reserves provided with additional funding could be looked at as a call to have more reserves based on dollars.

- Is OCNMS recommendation 6 appropriate to add to the NMSA or better served by inclusion in a policy statement? Chris Mobley explained that providing food is currently legally prohibited as reviewed by the Department of Justice but OCNMS is in a unique situation since there are no restaurants near the places where they meet.
- Craig Taylor indicated that the importance of SAC working groups should be heightened and these groups should be given the latitude to be action-oriented, not mere advisors. This will keep the interest of working group participants, allow them to feel empowered and that they are making an impact. The group decided that this could be expressed in the CINMS SAC charter.
- Regarding appropriations recommendations Chris Mobley explained that Dan Basta works to minimize politically-based decisions regarding allocation of funds among sanctuaries. Chris indicated that he would rather see the National Marine Sanctuary Program make those decisions than have Congress dictating where to spend money, especially considering the amount of earmarking they engage in already. Rebecca Roth concurred but suggested that but SAC could state that California sanctuaries are not getting enough money given its population and the resource issues we're tackling.
- Unlike some other sites CINMS does not have special use permit authority.
- Consider incentives for innovative management techniques such as providing programs that produce results with more funding. This has potential to help satisfy Congress' desire for more accountability: programs that want funds must show results. See Sec. 301(b)(8).
- Chris Mobley indicated that any change to a sanctuary designation document triggers development of an environmental impact statement (EIS). It may be a better use of taxpayer dollars to evaluate whether designation document changes warrant an EIS using the same criteria applied to most federal actions: does the action have the potential to result in a significant change for people or the environment? If not an environmental assessment could be conducted instead.

## **Nominations and Election for SAC Vice-Chair**

Mike Murray stated that the SAC needs to elect a Vice-Chair to provide back-up when Chair Matt Cahn is not available, to help draft agendas, and along with the Chair and Secretary (all three officers makeup the SAC Executive Committee) to review applications for open SAC seats and suggest the top three applicants. Mike announced that the eligibility criterion for the Vice-Chair is that they be a member, government or non-government. Mike also mentioned that every year all SAC Chairs gather for a national meeting, with expenses paid by the National Marine Sanctuary Program. He shared that this year Grays Reef National Marine Sanctuary will host the meeting in Savannah, Georgia. Since Matt cannot attend either the new Vice-chair will go or the SAC must choose another voting member who can represent this SAC to attend.

Bob Duncan nominated Jim Brye. Greg Helms offered a second. Michael Hanrahan nominated Greg Helms who declined due to his status as an alternate. Craig Taylor nominated Gary Davis who also declined due to his status as an alternate. Matt Cahn indicated that Jim has served for five years now, adding that he is not one of those who has to have word on everything, and shares his thoughts clearly regardless of the popularity of his view. Matt suggested that Jim would be a wonderful Vice-Chair and endorsed his nomination. The quorum of SAC voting members present verbally agreed to the nomination so Mike Murray stated that written ballots would not be necessary, and we have Jim Brye as Vice-Chair.

Jim offered thanks for the flattering comments and stated that he is happy to do what he can. He noted that he will be at sea for part of the time during this next term.



## **Working Group and Ad-Hoc Group Reports**

Matt Cahn suggested that in the few minutes left of the meeting Bob Duncan share the new CINMS brochure and discuss dates for future meetings.

### ***Ad-Hoc Enforcement Group (Robert Duncan)***

Bob Duncan acknowledged that 95% of the heavy lifting on the brochure was done by [sanctuary staff] Julie Bursek and Sean Hastings. He stated that the brochure is a piece of great value to Fish and Game, the park, Coast Guard and sanctuary. 10,000 of them will be printed. Bob offered to bring the true final version back to the SAC in January so he asked that many representatives show up at the January meeting so that they can keep people engaged.

Sean Hastings recognized the hard work that the committee Chair and committee members put into this. Sean presented a small token of thanks, a National Marine Sanctuary Program baseball cap, to Bob Duncan, Eric Kett and Jim Brye, and stated that the big thanks will come in January when there will be a formal recognition of the whole group.

Due to time constraints, the remainder of the Working Group reports were skipped.

## **Future SAC Meeting Schedule and Agenda Topics**

Matt Cahn referred to a hand out with suggested dates for meetings and the retreat for the next year. The meeting dates are January 23<sup>rd</sup>, March 19<sup>th</sup>, May 21<sup>st</sup>, July 23<sup>rd</sup>, September 24<sup>th</sup>, and November 19<sup>th</sup>, which are all Fridays. The suggested retreat dates fall between October 25<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. Mike Murray indicated that to the best of his knowledge, assuming the Fish and Game Commission approves their meeting agenda, he tried to ensure that there will be no conflicts with these dates.

SAC members present agreed to these dates unanimously.

**The Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 P.M.**

*Meeting notes respectfully submitted by:*

*Sarah MacWilliams (sarah.macwilliams@noaa.gov)  
and Michael Murray (michael.murray@noaa.gov)  
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary*